

Remarks

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested.

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 1-31 are pending in the application, with claims 1, 13, 15, and 27 being the independent claims.

Based on the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Office Action indicates that claims 1-12 and 15-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,462,676 to Koizumi (hereinafter "Koizumi"). (See, Office Action at ¶ 2.) The Office Action also indicates that claims 13 and 14 are unpatentable over Koizumi in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,908,465 to Ito *et al.* (hereinafter Ito). (See, Office Action at ¶ 3.) Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Koizumi should be removed as a prior art reference under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). The present application claims the benefit of U.S. Provisional Patent Appl. No. 60/199,551, filed April 25, 2000. (See, Specification at ¶ 1.) The Koizumi patent was filed October 27, 2000. Thus, the effective filing date of the present application predates Koizumi such that it should not be applied as a prior art reference against the present application. (See, M.P.E.P. § 706.02.)

Furthermore, regarding claims 13 and 14, Ito does not disclose, teach, or suggest a second *area* being *defined* in terms of a *set of latitudes and longitudes*. Ito states:

In a case where the retrieval of the telephone-number data shown in FIG. 28 reveals that there are no east longitude and north latitude coordinates of the registered telephone number corresponding to the entered telephone number, the east longitude and north latitude coordinates of the representative location are retrieved, and a range for retrieving structure-shape map data shown in FIGS. 5(A) and 5(B) is set from the retrieved coordinates.

(Ito at col. 24, lines 26-35.) In other words, the *point* of a location is identified by a *single* latitude coordinate and a *single* longitude coordinate and a range is set to surround the identified point. Latitude and longitude coordinates are not used to define an area. Therefore, claims 13 and 14 are patentable over Ito.

Accordingly, Applicant requests that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be reconsidered and withdrawn for claims 1-31 and that these claims be passed to allowance.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicant believes that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.



Edward W. Yee
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 47,294

Date: Sept. 24, 2003

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934
(202) 371-2600